

2000, pages 66-71.¹ Claims 6 and 7, which were added in the previous Amendment, also appear to be rejected over the same references as set forth above with respect to the rejections of claim 1-5, even though the Office Action does not specifically indicate the references that claims 6 and 7 are rejected over.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Behr does NOT “explicitly disclose an information control means located between the server and the terminals for converting the map information from the server without analyzing content of the obtained map information based on a display distribute of each terminal,” however the Examiner alleges that “such feature is well known and shown in at least figure 1 and the related text of the Warabino”. In response, Applicant submits that nowhere does Fig. 1 of Warabino teach or suggest at least that an information control means “converts the obtained map information without analyzing content of the obtained map information, based on the display description information of said at least one terminal apparatus,” as recited in claim 1. Warabino does not even mention the above-underlined feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 set forth above. Further, the text of Warabino that corresponds to Fig. 1 only mentions that proxies (as shown in Fig. 1) receive Web content such as HTML and image data from Web servers, and relay them to mobile clients after transcoding; there is no mention of the specific feature of claim 1 set forth above. Therefore, at least because each and every feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, are not taught or suggested by Warabino, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Applicant submits that independent claim 4 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

¹ Applicant believes that the Examiner mistakenly mentioned Mohan in numbered paragraph 6.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 3, and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 4.

With respect to independent claims 6 and 7, the Examiner essentially rejects these claims for the same rationales as set forth for claims 1-3. The Examiner, however, does not demonstrate and the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the particular limitations of claims 6 and 7. That is, Behr in view of Warabino does not teach or suggest at least “converts only map information of said at least map information” and “converts the obtained map information based only on the display description information of said at least one terminal apparatus”, as recited in claims 6 and 7, respectively.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 18, 2004